

**OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

(A Statutory Body of Govt. of NCT of Delhi under the Electricity Act of 2003)

**B-53, Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi-110057**

(Phone: 011-41009285 E.Mail elect\_ombudsman@yahoo.com)

**Appeal No. 17/2025**

(Against the CGRF-BRPL's order dated 09.01.2025 in CG No. 153/2024)

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**Smt. Renu Devi**

**Vs.**

**BSES Rajdhani Power Limited**

**Present:**

Appellant: Smt. Renu Devi along with her spouse Shri Vidya Nand Choudhary.

Respondent: Shri R.M. Meena, DGM, Shri C.M. Sharma, Commercial Officer and Shri Shreyak Gupta, Advocate, on behalf of BSES-BRPL.

Date of Hearing: 04.06.2025

Date of Order: 05.06.2025

**ORDER**

1. Appeal No. 17/2025 dated Nil has been filed by Smt. Renu Devi, R/o B-2/358, Tara Nagar, Dwarka More, Delhi – 110078, against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – Rajdhani Power Limited (CGRF-BRPL)'s order dated 09.01.2025 in CG. No.: 153/2024/F2/03.

2. The background of the case is that the Appellant, Smt. Renu Devi received an inflated electricity bill amounting to Rs.15,520/- in July, 2024, for her connection bearing CA No. 153003291 installed at the above cited premises. She approached the Discom to rectify this bill, as her monthly energy consumption has never exceeded beyond 150 units. In response, the Discom informed that her sanctioned load had been enhanced from 1 Kw to 5 Kw, as such, this bill includes energy charges and load enhancement charges. The bill was further also increased to Rs.16,210/-. Not satisfied with Discom's response, the Appellant filed a complaint before the Forum seeking correction of the



impugned bill and reversal of any other charges, which stood levied without her consent. The Appellant further submitted that during the personal visit to the Discom's Janakpuri branch, an officer demanded an amount of Rs.2,000/- for the bill correction and stated that this issue would only be resolved at their Pritam Pura branch.

3. The Discom, in response submitted before the Forum, a detailed clarification, i.e., Meter Testing Report, Revision of Sanctioned Load, Meter Change Report, Bill Revision and Last Payment received regarding the challenged bill vide their e-mail dated 27.11.2024, along with their copies, which were taken on record by the Forum. The Discom stated that bill has been revised and found to be in order, and the Appellant was liable to pay an outstanding dues of Rs.13,450/-.

4. In response to the e-mail dated 27.11.2024, the Appellant filed a rejoinder via e-mail dated 10.12.2024, stating that after raising a complaint, a Discom's engineer confirmed that the meter was functioning correctly. However, in response to a written complaint, the Discom confirmed that the meter was broken with watermarks, rust and a faulty display. The Appellant asserts that these issues were not caused by her as she had properly taken care of the meter. As such, she should not be held responsible for the faulty meter as stated by the Discom. The Appellant once again requested the Forum to rectify the alleged bill based on her past consumption records.

5. On 16.12.2024, the Appellant submitted another complaint via e-mail requesting the reconnection of her electricity connection, stating that despite the fact that matter was pending in the Forum for adjudication, the Discom had disconnected her electricity connection, which caused undue harassment to her. The Appellant forwarded this e-mail to various Authorities and Departments.

6. The Forum, in its order dated 09.01.2025 observed that in the Meter Testing Report dated 31.08.2024, accuracy of the meter was found within the permissible limit (+0.64%) with remarks that meter box was found broken. Consequently, the bill for the month of July, 2024 for 1288 units was generated based on the downloaded readings. Subsequently, another meter test was carried out on 24.09.2024, which found 'no clear display' issue, resulting in replacement by a new meter No. 41310664 on 02.10.2024. The Forum also considered other issues, i.e. enhancement of sanctioned load, disconnection and restoration of supply, while the matter was pending for adjudication. Keeping in view of the financial position of the Appellant, the Forum directed the Discom to consider the possible relaxation in the billed amount. In reply, the Discom provided a final calculation via e-mail dated 07.01.2025, proposing a payment of Rs.9,230/- to be made in three installments.

In view of the above, the Forum ordered that:



- (a) The consumer Smt. Renu Devi must apply for the load reduction from 5 Kw to 1 Kw against CA No. 1153003291.
- (b) The Discom would waive off the amount of Rs. 3,600/- and Rs. 810/- on account of security deposit and late payment surcharges, respectively.
- (c) The Discom will recover the net billing amount of Rs.9,230/- in five equal installments through regular billing, beginning from January, 2025.
- (d) The Discom will not initiate any action, such as, disconnection of electricity till the recovery of outstanding dues in five installments. However, thereafter they are free to take needful action in line with the prevailing regulations.

7. The Appellant, aggrieved from the above-mentioned order has filed this appeal on the ground that the Discom had raised in July, 2024 a bill for 1288 units on account of display fault and the meter was broken/damaged, as a result of the increase in the load. As a result, an inflated bill was raised without considering her previous months' consumption pattern. Furthermore, being a street vendor with minimum earnings, she is unable to pay such an exorbitant bill. The Appellant also denied any claims of theft of energy at her premises. Moreover, the Discom also sent a disconnection notice to her on 09.03.2025.

The Appellant has requested (i) to waive off the entire bill for outstanding dues, (ii) to review the bill thoroughly to correct any discrepancies, and (iii) to grant stay on disconnection notice till the issue is resolved.

8. In its written submission dated 15.04.2025 to appeal, the Discom reiterated the facts placed before the CGRF-BRPL. In addition, the Discom submitted that the Appellant did not challenge the disconnection notice dated 09.03.2025 before the CGRF. Furthermore, on the directions of the Forum, the Discom considered maximum relaxation with payment of net payable amount of Rs.9,230/- in three installments. However, the Forum further provided relaxation permitting payment of substantially reduced amount in five equally monthly installments, and directed to the Appellant to apply for a load reduction, which has not been complied with nor has any payment been received till date. Moreover, the Appellant did not challenge any of the specific observations or findings under paragraph 17 (1) to (iv) of the Forum's order, which is under challenge.

9. Regarding the Appellant's claim that an increase in load capacity led to the damage of meter resulting in a higher bill, the Discom submitted that the Appellant has not filed any documentation to corroborate such contention. Whereas, in her complaint before CGRF, she has stated that an engineer confirmed the meter was functioning properly. It was only, in response to their written submissions dated 15.04.2025, she has claimed that the meter's capacity was increased to 5 Kw due to a fault and she never



requested for change in sanctioned load. In fact she had requested for urgent review and correction of the bill. The Respondent had already provided a detailed response to the Appellant vide e-mail dated 27.11.2024, justifying their actions. The Discom submitted all the relevant documents to support their contention, which were taken on record. The Discom also asserted that financial status of an individual should not be taken into account in adjudicating due payment.

10. The appeal was admitted and fixed for hearing on 04.06.2025. During the hearing, the Appellant was present in person and the Respondent was represented by their authorized representatives/advocate. An opportunity was given to both the parties to plead their respective cases at length and relevant questions were asked by the Ombudsman and Advisors.

11. During the hearing, the Appellant reiterated her allegation about excess bill for 1288 units amounting to Rs.15,520/-, although the consumption pattern was never in excess of 150 units per month. The new meter was installed in the month of October, 2024. On the basis of a query by the Ombudsman, the record produced by the Respondent indicated that the consumption pattern during the months of January, 2025 to March, 2025 was below 200 units, and, therefore, a resultant 'zero' bill.

12. Controverting the submissions made by the appellant, the Advocate for the Respondent submitted that on the basis of the downloaded data, the bill was prepared which indicated consumption of 1288 units. The meter had got damaged due to hit by a truck, as informed by the Appellant. As regards the load increase from 1 Kw to 5 Kw, the same was also based on MDI recorded during the year 2023-24 mentioning the highest consumption during the particular period. The Advisor (Engg.) while referring to the record submitted by the Discom on the consumption pattern during the years 2022 to 2024 mentioned that there was a total consumption of 542 units during 2022, whereas the consumption during the year 2023-24 was 1099 units, making it 90 units consumption per month. A similar pattern of the consumption after the meter was replaced emerged during the period after the change of the meter. The sudden surge in the consumption as 1288 was a possible technical snag which could be for many reasons. There was no satisfactory response to the disconnection of the electricity for about one week during the period 16.12.2024 to 23.12.2024, as also observed by the Forum in its order, during the pendency of the matter before the Forum and such disconnection was not in adherence to any provision in the DERC's Supply Code and also in violation of Section 56 of Electricity Act, on account of non compliance with the laid down procedure.

13. Having taken all factors, written submissions and arguments into consideration, the following aspects emerge:



- (i) Abnormal consumption of 1288 Units of July 2024, remains unexplained. Actual reading is not in consonance with MDI, which is zero. It proves that the meter was defective.
- (ii) Energy meter test /analysis report of dated 03.10.2024 mentioned LCD not okay, data could be not downloaded & meter body found in broken condition, which establishes meter was damaged. Thus meter was damaged as well as defective also.
- (iii) On the basis of meter test report of dated 24.09.2024, meter was replaced on 2.10.2024.
- (iv) The action by Discom for disconnection, also condemned by CGRF, during pendency of matter before CGRF, was violative of Regulation 45 and is in violation of Section 56 of the Electricity Act.
- (v) Bills needs revision in the light of provision of Regulation 39(1) of DERC's Supply Code, 2017 – average consumption recorded during corresponding period in the preceding year.
- (vi) The load revision from 1 Kw to 5 Kw was in apparent consonance with Regulation 17(4). Yet nobody in the hierarchy of Discom could see the anomaly that during the period of high MDI, i.e. 9.5 and 8.59, the consumption was found to be only 77 both the times, which seems to be a mis-match. However, the Respondent has not followed up proper procedure of supply disconnection as per 51(1)(i), no copy of any notice found is placed on record.


14. In the light of the above, this court directs as under:

- (a) The CGRF-BRPL's order is set-aside.
- (b) Bill of July 2024 be revised on the basis of actual average consumption recorded during the corresponding period of July, 2023.
- (c) Load should be reduced from 5 Kw to 1Kw w.e.f. 01.01.2025. Security amount, fixed charges revision etc. be credited in the ensuing bill.
- (d) It was found that the electricity got disconnected while the matter was pending with CGRF, which is unfortunate. CEO may like to issue strict instructions and devise an SOP accordingly, emphasizing the need for strict compliance with Regulation 45 of DERC's Supply Code as well as Section 56 of the Electricity Act.



15. This order of settlement of grievance in the appeal shall be complied within 15 days of the receipt of the certified copy or from the date it is uploaded on the website of this Court, whichever is earlier. The parties are informed that this order is final and binding, as per Regulation 65 of DERC's Notification dated 24.06.2024.

The case is disposed off accordingly.

  
(P.K. Bhardwaj)  
Electricity Ombudsman  
05.06.2025